

**Mecklenburg County
Juvenile Crime Prevention Council Regular Meeting
May 21st 2020**

Members Present: Ashley Murrell, Sonya Harper, Kendra King, Kevin Poirier, Leigh Altman, Jessica Davis, Russell Price, Jason Tryon, Heather Taraska, Wanda Douglas, Lt. Gene Lim, Brittney Bogues, David Strickland, Dr. Cotrane Penn, Denise Steele-Campbell, Janelle Fleck, Tomika Moore

Staff Present: Scott Stoker, Elizabeth Swann

Guests Present: Shavonda McClure-Tresports, Cara Evans-Patterson-CMPD Youth Diversion, Glenn Smith-Life Connections-DASH, Matt Simon-Thompson Child & Family Focus, Alvick Ward-People Change, Joe Mynatt-Guest, Michael Jackson- Elite Focus Inc, Robin Sturdivant-Team Up Connections, Shannon Chambers-TYM-SHIFT, Robert Reynolds-Tresports, Michael Clark- Child & Family Services, Darryl Bego-Youth Development Initiatives, Ira Lawrence-Bunk 57 Ministries,

Members Absent: Dr. Keith Cradle, Commissioner Pat Cotham, Tysha Shaw

The meeting was called to order at 4:39 p.m. by the Chair Kevin Poirier. Quorum was established.

Review and Approval of May 21st 2020 Agenda:

Kevin allowed council members to review the agenda. Leigh Altman moved to accept the agenda. Heather Taraska seconded. The council unanimously approved the agenda.

Review and Approval of January, February, April 2020 Minutes: Kevin allowed council members to review the minutes. Lt. Gene Lim moved to approve the meeting minutes. Brittany Bogues seconded. The council approved the minutes.

Welcome

JCPC Chair Kevin Poirier facilitated attendance of JCPC Council members.

Announcements / Reminders

The attendance requirement is now 65% of all regularly scheduled committee meetings.

The inclusion of special and assigned subcommittee meetings is no longer applicable, its 65% of all regularly scheduled meetings. There are no excused absences. Members cannot miss three consecutive regularly scheduled committee meetings. To have action in the subcommittee meetings there must be a quorum to be able to vote.

Budget Revision- Youth Development Initiative (YDI)

A link was provided for JCPC members to view the budget request due to the virtual meeting status. The line item adjustment is within the #300 budget category. Due to the reduction of transportation services from the COVID-19 pandemic, the amount of \$7,500 will be allocated to Line #390 which is Other Services for an annual audit.

Question: How was the audit going to be paid for otherwise ?

YDI: if the line adjustment was not approved, we would take it out of the general budget and look at other revisions.

Wanda Douglas made a motion to amend the budget revision for YDI . Leigh Altman seconded. The council approved the budget revision.

FY20-21 Funding Decisions / FY20-21 Funding Worksheet

The funding allocation worksheet was provided for JCPC members to view at the end of the meeting due to the virtual meeting status. Kevin stated he would like to have some conversation around what the priorities of the JCPC council are in terms of what type of services they would like to get funded. To also think about what they hear regarding their positions in the community and the Risk & Needs data that has been provided. As discussions commence, Kevin will make changes to the spreadsheet. Kevin advised the council members that would like to make a comment to utilize the participant feature in the chat field of raising your hand. The total available funds are \$2,051,173. The total requested is FY20-21 is \$2,555,198.

Questions: *Is there a document that can be provided regarding the greater needs for the community? Kevin showed the FY18-19 Risk & Needs assessment data.*

Sonya Harper mentioned that we have programs that have applied where they have been the only applicant within a certain service, maybe that would make a good starting point to look under those categories. The residential program for \$350,000 match that the county provided this past year is also recommended for the upcoming fiscal year.

Questions: *What is the total amount of money Thompson residential will be getting this coming year? The cost that Thompson came forth with to operate is \$700,000 , the county came forth with \$350,000 match, the county didn't have the money to fund the whole amount, the temporary shelter care is a service that we've not had for quite some time.*

Questions: *For clarification was Thompson getting a lot of funds from sources outside of the county ? And if so, I was not looking to allocate any more funding.*

Thompson : We are a non-profit and we do have other fundraising money for other programs, like our Friends of the Children mentoring which is 100% philanthropic but this program doesn't have other funding sources. There is not insurance billing associated with the residential program which is why its unique and can be utilized by the court counselors' team because it doesn't have to pass through the normal insurance channels .

Questions: *Looking at the requested amount on the spreadsheet, there is a recommended funding column, does that mean we have to agree on what's being requested or can that number be altered?*

Kevin: The number can be completely altered by the JCPC council.

Kevin mentioned as of right now we have fully funded the JCPC Admin, SHIFT Restitution and Thompson Residential.

Jessica D: *If we negate the funding from the county, what does that look like, if we reduce the number as far as operations are concerned ? Will we have any wiggle room if any for funding ? Last year there were some hick-ups of getting off the ground. Thompson originally was going to serve 64 kids and they've only served 15 ?*

Thompson: *Serving kids in mid-November, there were some challenges with getting the building license up and running. We now have five young men in the program with another few in the admissions pipeline, we continue to take kids thru the COVID-19 crisis. The program has momentum now and we are done with our first-year challenges. We will probably go into July with a completely full census, so coming down lower than \$700,000, most residential programs cost more than that and that would be difficult for us. I assume the county match is contingent upon the JCPC money invested.*

Sonya H: *The recommended funds were budgeted for FY21 in the event the money was not spent down it would just simply turn back to the county at the end of the year.*

Russell P: *Our dept is committed to refer the right kids to the program, we must consider the types of kids, ages, gang involvements....etc. We want the program to be successful, so we took all that into consideration. It is a resource that we really need, we have use them considerably since the COVID-19 had started. The numbers are low due to the types of kids we have to consider going into the program.*

Leigh A: *Several of the programs focused on vocational development and helping to connect kids with things that they really enjoy doing, giving them a marketable skill, which is important for self-esteem, self-confidence and a host of other things. I am interested in the YDI Vocational & Career Development and DASH Vocational.*

Jessica Davis, Wanda Douglas, Jason Tryon agrees with Leigh regarding the needs in the community for a vocational program

Kendra King: *On board with YDI vocational & career program because they are specific and they have a variety of instructional programs to connect with the youths,*

Sonya H: *The potential for older kids entering the system is a service that needs to be there. One thing to point out we have a few new programs that have applied this year for first time funding. There also have been programs that have submitted multiple applications, granted those are different services. However, we need to be conscientious of that as we get into funding.*

Dr. Penn: *There are two vocational skills program and if it's our goal to provide funding for one program it may not necessarily be a goal but when I compare the two programs aside from cost one of the primary differences that I see is that DASH Life Connections program does provide GED training and YDI doesn't. A significant portion of 16 & 17 yr. old are no longer in school and so I think that the Life Connection vocational inclusion of a GED course is something to consider.*

Kevin states the consensus seems to be to fund both vocational programs. However, to Sonya's point to leave some opportunity to the new programs so we're not funding the same programs.

Sonya H: *I would also recommend ASOP (Achieving Success on Purpose), which was the only application that was received for group counseling.*

Kendra K: *in agreeance with Sonya, from recollection he's either a license clinical addiction specialist or mental health clinician, but I like how he uses chess in order to incorporate that into life skills and the program offers mentoring as well. Even though it's from a therapeutic background I think it gives a different perspective on being able to cover vast services.*

Jessica D: *I believe he is also a former officer, so he has the background knowledge. I would also call attention to the group regarding assessment as well, we only have one other program that has submitted for that.*

Dr. Penn: *I would like to support funding for ASOP at full cost, I don't believe we have funded a clinical program.*

Tomika M: *Agreeance as well looking at the data needs that was provided about substance abuse and history of victimization.*

Leigh A: *I have been in close contact with the Council for Children's Rights, which provides all the attorneys defense for juvenile offenders because I think they have a tremendous amount of insight on this conversation. I wanted to relay some of those priorities for consideration: we were under the impression that Thompson residential program was getting most of the funding from outside, I now know that's incorrect. The priorities I was hearing are YDI Life Skills Academy, YDI Vocational & Career Development all three of the Life Connections DASH, Tresports and Thompson Court Assessments to put out that feedback for the group to consider.*

Heather T: Transportation is a real need for the population. The court assessments I've been covering in detention hearings from my office for the last 2 ½ months routinely every session there are more juveniles being detained because they need an assessment so that a determination can be made about where they need to go. They can't go to Thompson residential unless someone speaks with them first to make a recommendation. We don't have anything like that in the system. This position should be funded by the county or state, this should be implemented into the budget. We should continue to fund the court assessment.

Janelle F: Agrees with the proposal as a clinical service for the youth's evident key factors that impact that age group.

David S: Being in court on a daily basis, these programs are popular with the kids Tresports, DASH, Thompson which are active and involved with court hearings.

Kevin stated he is hearing consensus around ASOP, Thompson Court Assessment and Tresports.

Russell P: Agreeing with court assessment to find resources in place. We also need interpersonal skill building programs which are essential, they typically work with the lower level risks youth. We don't refer directly to CMPD Diversion, however what they do impacts the numbers that come into our offices, the goal is to divert them from the juvenile justice system and that's what they do. So, what we see in court is usually the high-risk kids and that's how it should be. Tresports and DASH Mentoring has historically worked well with these populations, they engage difficult families, they attend court sessions, sit in on child and family team meetings, the kids have a connection and the programs are working.

Dr. Penn: Question about the CMPD's numbers, if my interpretation of the presentation is accurate for FY19-20 they were funded at 140 youth and given what might be on the horizon with COVID-19, the request for this year is 400? I would fund the CMPD Diversion at a lower number like 250 youths. The increase is substantial based on the funding previous years. I'm questioning would they be able to obtain 400 youths in the new calendar year? Could they run the program with a lower number?

Heather T: we must consider Raise the Age has happened in December 1st and planning to serve the population, they could easily obtain that number. Everyone has good recommendations for DASH & Tresports, I think very highly of them, they have enhanced their programs over time.

Wanda D: DASH continues to do good work and they are asking for less money this year than last year.

Heather T: CMPD Diversion put in the chat box they have served 600 each year.

The consensus is CMPD Youth Diversion. Tresports, DASH, it may be worth to start plugging in the numbers.

Russell P: the new program I looked at is Team-Up Connections, some of the court counselors have made referrals have praised them with the mentoring they have done with the kids and Achieving Success On Purpose has been working with CMPD and doing a great job.

Lt.Lim: I will abstain from voting on any funding regarding CMPD, due to my employer. In working closely and not directly supervising Diversion, I do see how they have adapted to COVID-19 crisis, connected with the youth contacts and CMPD resource officers are on hand to assist CMPD Diversion. Based on the annual numbers, they shouldn't have any problems meeting their numbers.

Denise Steele-Campbell: Team Up Connections have done very positive work in the community and I would like to recommend them.

Jessica D: regarding Team-Up Connections from a strictly funding financial standpoint is the cost difference between Team-Up Connections and DASH Mentoring. It appears Team-Up Connections is prepared to serve more youths at a reduced amount, so if we are looking at numbers, funding, meeting

goals, and serving our youth from a mentoring standpoint we should give Team-Up Connections some consideration.

Sonya H: the CMPD diversion program, they have requested a significant funding this year, then they have received in the past, serving up to 600 kids per year already. The question is if the JCPC were to fund them at higher amounts would those additional JCPC funding be used to plant current funding that CMPD already has to serve the 600 kids? My concern would be is that they already have a funding source place to be able to support that program. We also would like to fund new programs and to be able to expand some of those services. I don't want us picking up the tab for a service that's already been paid for with another source

CMPD: formally we had funds for Governor Crime Commission, but they haven't funded us for the last 2 years.

Sonya H: how have you paid for 600 kids if you haven't had that funding ?

CMPD: CMPD has been footing the bill, but that's not in the CMPD's budget and we were looking to get reimbursed and we have not.

Sonya H: I would also like to reiterate I would support Team-Up Connections. There's another program on here that's really asking for a relatively small amount of funds, being Bunk 57 ministries, a little over \$57,000. One of the other things also to point out about that program is the folks with that program have a lived experience. We are looking at a lot of justice programming for kids and adults that are just as involved, typically you do see a positive impact from folks that have lived that experience. The programs are worth looking at

Ashley M: we are running over the allocated \$2M for the fiscal year. I think it would be important to fully fund the newer programs, such as DASH If they have multiple programs kind of cut back on those programs just a little bit, but at least give these newer programs an opportunity.

The consensus is around CMPD Youth Diversion, consider reducing the amount, Team-Up Connections, Bunk 57 Ministries, potentially DASH Mentoring, it may be worth it to start plugging in the numbers. Still over \$225,146. Any comments to look at cutting CMPD Diversion?

Russell P: I would be cautious, school complaints are down in Mecklenburg County comparison to the rest of the state, Mecklenburg is under 17% coming from the school system, the state average is 42-43%. CMPD is a huge part of this along with the school justice partnership, and the efforts by the school system to not send cases to address these behavioral issues in the school. What I don't want is to decide and then the numbers move in the wrong direction.

Dr. Penn: My first comment is related to Bunk 57 Ministries, it looks like a great program, but the fact that their capacity is only 12 youths, I question whether a 12-youth mentoring program is a worthwhile investment program for JCPC. Since we are debating whether to fully fund the CMPD Youth Diversion Program, if we didn't fully fund CMPD, yes we could take on Bunk 57 Ministries, but we might be trading a 100 kids for 12 and we have to look at the cost versus the benefit and the number of students that we are impacting based on what we choose to fund.

At this point in time we're out of money so we need to talk about who we won't fund and why, to only promote the programs that we want isn't helpful. The reality is we are out of money and we haven't even spoken about every program.

Lt. Lim: When we talk about CMPD picking up the bill for the Governor's Crime Commission, we have a youth program budget, but it's not guaranteed every year, we can make moves like that in our budget. It sacrifices other programming that we run and other things inside of our community services bureau. We don't have any control over those budgets, that's at a much higher level, it wouldn't be a guarantee that we would be able to continue to pick up funding based on our budget.

Leigh A: Team up Connections were using their money to purchase transportation, some of these other programs that already have their advance and none of our money goes to buy a sort of basic infrastructure to deliver the service. Someone purposed to talk about programs that we didn't want to fund. There's already support on this council for Team-Up Connections, I didn't want to fund Team-Up Connections at all and that is also the view of the person at Council for Children's Rights, who was listening closely to all of this also.

Russell P: we may want to consider, especially with the new program, the number of juveniles they anticipate serving ? Maybe the programs can reduce the number because I'm skeptical about programs that come in just starting up to service a huge number of kids which is a huge undertake. They may bite off more of what they can chew.

Sonya H: A lot of new programs have always struggled with being able to meet the capacity because receiving referrals has been a challenge for them. Taking that on, is something that we can do to be able to better support new programs. Coming back to Bunk 57 Ministries, they are starting with a small number. Bunk 57 Ministries has been in operation for a few years but having lived that experience is significant when you're working with this population.

I think that's fantastic that Council for Children's Rights are providing that input, but they are familiar with the programs that we fund year after year, But are they familiar with some of these new programs that we have come forth with proposals for the 1st time. I think it's very important for everyone to provide input, but I also don't want it weighing heavily on the input from one particular organization.

Leigh A: I don't want to imply in any way that the Council for Children's Rights was trying to push their views on anyone. I want everyone to know that I went to them because they have more contemporaneous exposure on the ground to some of these issues and identity. I went to them to obtain their input. They and I were excited about Bunk 57 Ministries and think they would bring a lot to the table.

Sonya H: when this was started we were \$500,000 over if we pay attention we may actually be able to provide funding for most of the programs that are there, also keeping in mind, we've got folks that have submitted more than one proposal, before we cut certain programs I would like us to be able to take a look at and be more precise in the way we are funding.

JCPC has in fact paid for vehicles in the past, we provided funding this past year for Tresports to purchase a van. This is not outside of what we normally do.

Kevin: Good points to be made about strategic funding and maybe not writing off a whole program because we were only \$500,000 over. In the past it has been helpful to start plugging in numbers for the funding recommendation. We have been meeting for an hour and ½ and I appreciate everyone's commitment.

David S: would like to mention, I agree with I've always said the two years I have been on JCPC council regarding trying to fund new programs. I think it's worth reminding them as far as what happened last year with Thompsons residential program. We gave them \$350,000 and we were assured that it would be approved, or the matching funds would be approved that did not happen until a later date, thru no fault from Thompson. So, for the 4 months of the fiscal year they were not operable. Due to the nature of their facility they are not working with a lot of youths. It's been mentioned a few times with fellow members and if the hard decisions is made just to not fund Thompson residential, then virtually every other program be funded with a minor reduction.

We may be at a place where we can motion to fund programs as a consensus. There's some decision making can be made in terms of motions and we can do that in two different ways We don't have to fund everything in one motion. We can fund the things that we want at full amount and then make amendments, and then we can work with the balance that we have. There's been a conversation telling a program to serve less youths and multiply cost per child. Or continue to put numbers in the "J" column to figure out where our math should be.

Sonya H: *I'm hesitant to take on both right now on funding a specific program when we really haven't worked thru all of these yet, because once we vote it doesn't leave any more flexibility to make adjustments.*

It's come to mind as far as with schools and I know there's a lot of things with COVID-19 that are still unknown, however the conversation about the school calendar potentially looking different. That'll be potentially a remote learning piece that will be interwoven into school operation, moving forward and will that have an impact on the number of kids in the school-based programs.

Kevin: Great question I've been thinking a lot about that as someone who works directly in the school and has realized the fact that no student has been suspended since March 13th unless it was by their parents in the home. In some ways across the district we've shut down the prison pipeline and so I think that is a consideration given the uncertainty of what school looks like in the fall.

I heard the point about the other programs that maybe we haven't had a chance to talk about, we gotten into interpersonal skill building, we didn't mention After School Academy, and for parent and family skill building there was consensus around lets fund DASH, but we haven't talked about Family Life Skills Academy, we spoke a little about Bunk 57. What are comments and thoughts about where we're at in terms of the types of services that we've talked about in specific programs ?

Kendra K: *What structure, curriculum or services would Bunk 57 be providing?*

Bunk 57: *they will be providing one on one mentoring as well as group counseling sessions, skill building and community service work. Group counseling will be screened by a license clinician before entering the program. Group sessions will be facilitated by group leaders that's professional field based on their program. There will be a license clinical therapist that will be working with the kids in the group session as well as the ministries that have a background in counseling . The application lists an MSW and a LCSW.*

Kendra K: *I know we talked about Team-Up Connections briefly, but I would like to know if any other members have any further questions about that particular program? With the new programs that are up for funding I'm just trying to make sure that we go through the new programs as much as possible, so we know exactly their services. I agree with Sonya with the COVID-19 pandemic, it is hard to gauge what it's going to look like regarding serving the youth in general, even though we're going into Phase 2. You still have to talk about social distancing and if programs are allowed to do face to face, will they operate at 50% capacity? How does that work ?*

Wanda D: *I think it might be also an opportunity to look at the fact that every year we fund programs and sometimes we must give the money back or change things throughout the year because of not meeting capacity. We might want to consider doing smaller amounts than what some of the programs are requesting and as we see how COVID-19 plays out there might be a shift in funds later, that there may be money coming back or left over that we can reallocated. Giving them something to start with versus nothing maybe be an option. We know we have months ahead of us that no one will be at full capacity.*

If we were to decide to fund certain programs at 50% at what they are requesting or whatever the amount ? Is it possible to have another funding meeting to reallocate remaining funds.?

Scott S: *Whatever unallocated money you have remaining you have until Dec 31st, 2020 to allocate and that means JCPC decision, BOCC approval and signatures. The latest you can decide for Mecklenburg County would be October maybe November. Any unallocated money after December returns to the General Fund(State)*

Kevin asks, how would that put us in with regard to when we were looking to reallocate money that we didn't get out today, would we go back to that original RFP to judge it? Or could we sort of have a system, where we ask "how did you do with the four months of funding that we gave you"? Or, could there be like a proof is in the pudding?

Scott S: That decision will be up to JCPC, you could do another RFP. The money could still go to all the programs that applied or met the minimum work requirements, or it could go just to currently funded programs.

Sonya H: If we were to fund the programs at the lesser amount whether it was requested last year or this year, would we have enough to be able to provide funding across the board and stay within budget?

Kevin's inputted figures on the spreadsheet for the JCPC council to view. For example, Tresports would be \$238,000, still over \$82,762. Made a scenario for potential and that was taking the lesser amount, CMPD Diversion at \$132,000, SHIFT Restitution at \$346,000 instead of \$348,000. Funding the programs from last year for the lesser amount and then funding the new programs at what they requested this year.

Dr. Penn: *There will be some impact from COVID-19, we don't know what direction this will go in, if we return to school and some kind of a format where kids go every other day we're going to have a lot of unsupervised youths that could play out with an increased need for JCPC programming. So, that's just a concern that I would have is where we don't know what's the possible COVID restrictions on school attendance will mean for juvenile crime.*

To someone's suggestion around originally funding programs for most of our programs, most of their budget is for staffing and every program that is using JCPC funds, primarily for staffing needs a baseline level of staffing to run the program at all. So, I think there maybe some programs where, if you made a significant cut to their funding request, they would not be able to run the program at all.

Russell P: *The other note I want to make is that some of these programs existing, already adjust when they do business. Yes, they send the kids virtually and some of them their numbers are up adapting the way they do business and there doing a good job at it. Another question that I have is making those contact with the kids virtually, does that change their funding at all? Is it less funding to do that? Are they saving if this was the way to do business, going forward could that save some money with their funding request?*

Going back to some of the new programs that requested to serve a good number of kids? Are they willing to take less to serve less kids for less funding?

Janelle F: *I had some of the same questions related to which of these programs could survive and do what they're designed to do if a cut in funding? I don't know if there's a way for us to get that information specifically from the programs based on recent events, are they still serving a 100% youth at the same rate based prior to COVID-19? Can they operate on the reduced budget?*

Also, with the new programs what they need just for basic operations, and if we funded them at 50%, hypothetically, what would that mean for them to at least get started for 3-6 months and reevaluate what their needs are at that point.

Sonya H: *when we are talking about funding, there are categories they could have reduced funding. Taking into account, programs having remote service, in this state, I think you would have reductions on transportation line, I can't see programs investing to the full amount for transportation, particularly if you are providing these services remotely, you wouldn't have a need to be transporting youths to a lot of places. I think the other one would be supplies things like manuals or handbooks. Those are things you*

would not be putting in their hands, it would be provided electronically. You would have reductions of certain lines just by providing remote service. Russell's point is valid and that is something we might want to consider.

Tomika M: looking at the way these were scored, can we filter those from highest to lowest. If I'm looking at this correctly, there's 3 low scoring programs that are asking for funds and we still haven't decided on if we can allocate anything. It looks like YDI's Family and Afterschool and Bunk 57 ministries.

YDI and Team-Up Connections have the same score. The reason why YDI is last is because it starts with a "Y". We still have to find \$225,000 in cuts from some program, the consensus so far has not been that there was support necessarily in funding these 3 programs.

Jessica D: We are funding 3 of 3 of the DASH programs. I don't know if anyone has an inclination one way or the other, but it would be my voter suggestion to fund Team-Up Connections and not the DASH Mentoring to give the new program the opportunity to get in the door and provide a service keeping in mind DASH still has 2 of its 3 programs recommended for funding.

Some council members were in agreeance with Jessica. It seems to be some consensus around seeing what the math looks like without DASH Mentoring, the overage is now \$94,840 with the consensus around having the mentoring to be covered by Team-Up Connections

In terms of the types of programs that we've have funding, we have 2 vocational skills program, 1 group counseling program, mentoring program, a temporary shelter care assessment, restitution, 1 parent family skill building and 2 interpersonal skill building programs currently.

Leigh A: I just don't think we can overstate the utility of giving kids options in things they love to do that can give them a purpose in life with marketable skills. The best pathway due to a difficult start in life which is full of great promise, which is important, maybe next year we can see who has better outcomes and whose models is creative and flexible.

Dr. Penn: I support the vocational programs; I think there is a gap in our service array. Is there a need to go from having zero vocational skills to having 2? We have seen in our schools the vocational programs have been offered at the end of completion in high school, kids acquire certification as plumbers, electricians, carpenters, kids haven't been interested in those programs, some of them have been shut down. We might be getting a bit of a false start by going so big the first year that we're trying it.

Russell P: I would be careful on pulling the plug on DASH Mentoring, the programs works and they serve a lot of kids, maybe we can look at potentially reducing the numbers in the programs and compromise there. I voted against them when they applied for funding, I strongly disagree with and didn't feel it would work. To see that it is working I do feel that I must advocate for them now and in saying that, Team-Up Connections is strong as well. Their asking to serve 120 kids which is a lot. My ask is that they look at the number of kids that they are requesting to serve.

Kevin mentioned in the chat box that Thompson would be willing to go down to the \$198,850 previously funded, which sounds like a good idea.

Sonya H: when talking about vocational programming, there is YDI and DASH proposals, looking at the numbers YDI is 50 kids and DASH is 35 kids the question that I would have for Russell is, do you think it's feasible that there would be enough referrals to be able to send 85 kids to training, because right now we're seeing those Raised the Age numbers running below DPS projections. We're not seeing a lot of the older kids hitting the system or programs, do we think there's enough kids out there to even be able to send referrals to meet the 85 If not then, do we want to look at maybe funding just one of the

programs? YDI serving 50 kids @\$139,000 DASH is talking about serving 35 for \$134,000, we will have a greater number of kids being served with YDI. What's DASH's level of comfort, if the council is looking to fund a vocational program, would we be willing to fund YDI and then DASH instead of your vocational program maybe potentially keep funding the mentoring program. All this is pending with the budget of our ability to do that.

The JCPC Admin budget a portion goes to pay for parking for JCPC and food for marathon JCPC meetings such as this one. We can carve \$5,000 because we're going to be in this remote status for a while.

David S: Refencing the 16-17 yrs. old, obviously, it's only been a few months since we've had COVID-19, the States position is that those matters are being transferred to adult court. I can't recall placing a 16-17yr old on probation, the matters are being transferred court, therefore they would not be a part of the JCPC program. Regarding vocational for more of our older kids, 16-17yr to the point, whether we need to fund both programs.

Sounds like consensus around taking one of the vocational programs and returning DASH mentoring?

Wanda D: Suggestion if the two vocational skills program YDI & DASH could merge together, but not at the full amount, would they be willing to do the program at half the cost of \$140,000 and population? I understand that will be a conversation between and YDI & DASH.

The RFP is centered around 1 program, it would go against what each program stated they were going to accomplish.

Leigh A: Do we have any data around how many kids who matriculate through our programs go onto to get associate or bachelor's degrees? If the academic path is not where we see several of them achieving. The fact that we have low enrollment speaks to our needs as a community to talk to parents and stakeholders to remove, what I think is something of a disinclination against vocational programs, trades, which can really provide great career paths where people can really make a salary. We need to do more work around it not back away from it.

In the chat box Team-Up Connections is willing to go down 20 kids less.

Lt. Lim: to ask the programs at this point to merge would be a little unfair, they constructed these programs on their own. There are differences in the proposal, and the way they do business, I want to say that DASH mentoring focuses on the GED aspect, and I think it's on us as a board is just to figure out what is the best based track record, performance and the presentation.

Kevin inputted \$1568 times 20 to reduce and got \$156,806.

Janelle F: comments in the chat box regarding providing 60-70% of funding with the adjustments that have had to been made with COVID-19 and then reevaluating? What the numbers would look like if we funded the programs, it appears SHIFT restitution is asking for \$348,000 and I don't know if numbers have been factored or adjusted related to the numbers served in the last few months. So I'm wondering if they do really need that full amount, or what would it require to keep the program moving.

What would be the lowest percentage for that program?

There has to be enough money in the bank for victims losses suffered as a result of a crime. The restitution bank normally runs out before the end of the funding period.

Kevin pulled the 70% funding potential scenario which brings it to \$1.56M. It leaves, \$500,000, if we were to cut everything by 30%. If we funded everything that we wanted to fund at 70%, notwithstanding the \$10,000 JCPC Admin and the \$350,000 Thompson residential match from the county.

Janelle F: Russell, do know the portion of that budget was separated out for restitution amounts ?

Scott S: The amount is \$25,000 for the restitution bank

Kevin stated, as it is currently again, we are still over \$31, 621.00. SHIFT restitution stated in the chat box we have reduced cost due to COVID-19 and could reduce our budget by \$15,000 without reducing the restitution bank.

Sonya H: *if we've made the 30% reduction across the board and that left \$1.5M. That leaves about \$485,000 on the table. Would that be enough to provide funding for for each program? We still have 3 programs that no funding allocated to. Kevin proceed to input figures on the worksheet for council members to view.*

The remaining \$350,00 for Thompson residential , \$10,000 for JCPC Admin and everyone was funded at 70% of their request we would still have little less than \$200,000. I have \$1,892,789 if we funded at that 70% scenario, that puts \$150,000 left on the table. We could potentially fund higher than 70%, probably 80%.

Tomika M: *What we're discussing to either help fund all of those that have been voted in already in or if we were still going to eliminate 2 or 3 programs , not allocate all of the funds all at once with COVID-19 pending to give us some low projection and to get some information from the programs, where have they landed to see where we can go forward.*

In the chat box was commented the newly suggested numbers will cut SHIFT too lean.

Kevin commented we can decide, and if there's consensus around funding every program at 70% or if you want to choose the programs you want to fund at 70% and then come back to the drawing board after COVID-19. Establishing a 70% cut allows more flexibility in funding programs.

What are the thoughts on 70% allocation and funding all programs. There seems to be a lot of conversation around intentionality around types of services?

Lt. Lim: *We started the meeting to identify the needs, checking the data while trying to determine who is providing services in the right ways to the best of our ability. To fund everybody undermines the whole reason why we have been here the last 3 hours. This is an important work and we're getting to a point where we're tired, but what is the justification to say everybody's going to get something no matter what ? What the reasoning?*

Kevin: We have gotten to that point before when that sort of thing has happened and I think that we would be wise to steer away from giving everyone, there's been intentionality behind it so far.

Tomika M: *I like the idea that those we have removed that had the overlap or a bunch of programs that have already been funded, keep it that way and do the 70% or 80% with the ones that we've selected.*

Is there any consensus around doing 80% or were we thinking 70%- 80% for the programs that we selected for funding?

Russell P: *In the past if we decided to cut programs or just give them a percentage of what they are requesting, we have given them the opportunity to speak on if they can operate and how it impacts them. DASH vocational was given Raise the Age funds for start-up, if we were not going to continue funding or a portion of that, why did we provide them with start-up funds. At times we must make tough decisions and sometimes the easy decision is to give everyone a piece of the pie, that might not be the right way to go.*

Sonya H: *The JCPC council, we decided to adjust scoring this year, lower the bar for programs to be able to get basically this point where we are right now. And going back to being intentional about funding new programs. I don't think the intention is just to cut everyone a piece of the pie, I think what we have are viable programs that have come forward and met the funding requirements. Other than duplication in the type of programs, I don't think we have made a case into why we should exclude some of these programs that have applications to get to this point. They were scored and presented, if we can make adjustment to have funding to be able to support those then we should consider that. We are currently \$31,621 over with the ones that we've selected to fund, that's with no 70-80% adjustment, if we make the 80% adjustment, we have remaining \$215,606*

Sonya H: *I find it difficult to have that amount of funding remaining and there are programs that we've not providing funding to*

David S: *The county manager in the previous 2 years have requested to have a reason why a program was not funded. If a program was not funded my understanding from the letter is that we would need to provide a specific reason why. My question would be if you had to cut some programs, do we have to give an explanation for each program the reasons for the cut to be in compliance with the county managers letter?*

Based on our funding document. I don't think that we'd have to give a requirement of why something was cut, but if we didn't fund it there should be some consensus and we are to provide the explanation.

For example, duplications, we've already funded interpersonal skills building we've already funded a mentoring, we've funded a vocational skill. That's one of choices on the funding documentation form.

Sonya H: *With the situation with COVID-19, they're going to be things in each one of these budgets that they are probably going to have a hard time spending down, particularly in transportation and supplies.*

Janelle F: *is there any anymore wiggle room from SHIFT for operating expenses so that we could put more funds towards newer programs?*

Dr. Penn: *Remember that part of the reason behind the proposed 20% blanket cuts for all programs that we are interested in funding is because want to have something left to anticipate in response to the unknowns, but I think going in with \$215,000 additional, I do think we have an opportunity to fund Bunk 57 Ministries and then sit with the remainder to address other shortfalls that other programs might have as the world kind of reopens more. I believe Bunk 57 is mostly salaries I wonder if it could sustain an 80% cut?*

Bunk 57: *we can sustain that cut and still be able to perform the functions that we need to perform.*

Comments in the chat about the vocational program, DASH was funded with Raise the Age and their up and running.

Sonya H: *related to previous comments in JCPC meetings, how many Raise the Age youths have been referred? Are the kids in the program Raise the Age kids? Or those that are below the age of 15yrs that would have been in juvenile justice anyway?*

DASH Life Connections: *all referrals come from JCC and they are Raise the Ages kids.*

DASH Vocational at 80% that's where we are now.

Wanda D: *that still leaves two programs that are not funded at all and we have \$67,000 left ? Yes, that is correct.*

If they are some programs that are higher scoring than some that we are funding , then we need to be clear on why we're doing it. The only programs not funded are YDI Family Life Skills and YDI Afterschool .

Dr. Penn: *Questions in the chat box arise from the public regarding funding programs with religious orientations? Bunk 57 ministries is not the only mentoring program we are funding, religion & spirituality can be a significant part of some people's faith to overcome challenges and coping skills. To my knowledge I don't think there is any restrictions in using JCPC funding for a program that has religious affiliation.*

We are at \$82,762 with remaining funds, the requested amount from the programs not funded is greater. YDI Family Life Skills is funded at \$75,035

Conversations ensued with putting the remaining \$7000 with SHIFT Restitution that would probably be a better use of those dollars since the restitution goes to victims. YDI Afterschool Academy is the only program not funded. We're already funding 2 interpersonal skill building that served 485 kids and the need for an additional 70. Potentially with the feedback I have heard regarding looking at the scores as well and the highest scoring interpersonal skill building programs that scored were CMPD Youth Diversions program and Tresports. We are also funding 2 parent family skill building programs and YDI Life Skills Academy and YDI vocational . Does anyone vehemently disagree with where the funding is at now?

Russell P: *The programs should be given an opportunity to state whether they can operate on the suggested funds.*

Kevin asked if the programs could respond if they're on the WebEx call looking at the numbers. The council members have come to a little bit of consensus because of the uncertainty of COVID-19 , in which ways programs ought to be able to to cut their budgets because of reduce cost.

CMPD Youth Diversion- will be able to make the adjustment with the funds received.

Tresports- will be able to adjust, and may reduce the kids to be served

DASH - we feel very fortunate on what we're getting, we may have to rework some kids, but we're going to continue to serve Mecklenburg County

SHIFT Restitution - will be able to make the adjustment with the funds received

Thompson Residential & Court Assessment - We honor the wishes of the council, I do think because that program pays for predominantly for the staff who provide those court assessments. It may potentially provide or make for some complications in the latter half of the year if additional opportunities don't come. The money will help us to start the program at full force and see where the year goes.

Team-Up Connections- will be able to make the adjustment with the funds received

YDI Family Life Skills & Vocational - We relish the opportunity to further validate our service to the court counselors and community.

Bunk 57 Ministries- We were blessed to get the help that we received, and we can make it work.

Achieving Success on Purpose- we will adjust accordingly

We've heard from all the programs in terms of their ability to adjust accordingly. The next step is to have a motion and second if there's more discussion, amendments and we may be ready to do a final JCPC recommendation with a motion.

Janelle F: On Thompson programs, I will have to abstain from voting due to a conflict of interest

Lt Lim - On CMPD Youth Diversion program, I will have to abstain from voting due to a conflict of interest

At this point, Kevin will entertain a motion for the funding of programs and will input the final JCPC recommendations based on the motion on the worksheet for the council members to view.

The motion on the table is to fund all the programs at the funding recommend in Column J

Leigh Altman made the motion to fund the programs listed at the funding recommendation listed in column J on the worksheet other than CMPD & Thompson due to conflicts, Ashley Murrell seconded. Kevin took a voting poll from the JCPC council members, 15 yes and 1 no. The motion passes.

Leigh Altman made a motion to fund the CMPD Youth Diversion program at the amount listed in Column J. Jessica Davis seconded. Kevin took a voting poll from the JCPC council members, 15 yes and 1 abstain. The motion passes

Jessica Davis made a motion to fund the Thompson Residential & Court Assessment programs at the amount listed in Column J. Denise Steele-Campbell seconded. Kevin took a voting poll from the JCPC council members, 13 yes, 1 no, 2 abstain. The motion passes.

The final JCPC recommendation has been voted on, Kevin thanked the work that each of the JCPC council members and programs does in their communities to support or directly meet the needs of the youth and families at great risk. Your actions help create better futures for individuals, your community and North Carolina.

Committee Reports:

State programs check your emails for correspondence

County-funding plan will be on June 2nd @ BOCC meeting, once plan is approved, someone from Criminal Justices Services will reach out to the programs regarding their contract with the county

Marketing Committee N/A

Monitoring Committee N/A

Risk &Needs Committee N/A

Funding Committee N/A

Bi-Laws Committee N/A

Nominating Committee N/A

Program Support N/A

Executive Committee next meeting will be June 18th unless otherwise notified

Heather Taraska made a motion to adjourn. Jason Tryon seconded. Meeting was adjourned at 8:12pm.

Minutes submitted by Elizabeth Swann

